REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the final Office action dated December 27, 2007. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 13, 24, 26-27, 29-30, and 32. Claims 1 and 3-33 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings.

Support for Amendments to the Claims

Some of the claims have been amended to include determining a status of a tile, wherein the status includes at least one of banned, hidden, newly installed, uninstalled, and visible. Support for the status of the tile can be found, for example, at Table 1 and paragraph [0075]-[0088] of the Application.

Some of the claims have been amended to include a request to manipulate a tile including relocating the selected tile within the sidebar, adding the selected tile to the sidebar, removing the selected tile from the sidebar, hiding the selected tile in the sidebar, banning the selected tile from the sidebar, and showing the selected tile in the sidebar. Support for these manipulations can be found, for example, in the Application at paragraphs [0059] and [0064]-[0075].

Some of the claims have been amended to recite a tile configuration user interface program. A tile configuration user interface program (e.g., a sidebar interaction module) is discussed in the Application at, for example, paragraph [0068].

Some of the claims have been amended to recite to manipulation rule sets: a user manipulation rule set and an application manipulation rule set. Support for these rule sets can be found in the Application, for example, at paragraph [0014].

Some of the claims have been amended to recite that the application providing an application manipulation request is associated with the selected tile at which the request is directed. Support for this relationship can be found in the Application, for example, at paragraph [0057].

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-9, 12-20, and 23-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403 to Santoro et al. (hereinafter Santoro). Applicants

submit that the cited reference fails to teach each and every element of the claims of the present application.

Santoro is directed to a program for defining and implementing a grid of tiles. In Santoro tiles defined by the program implementing the grid are added to the grid via a template of default tiles chosen by a user and/or via user interaction with a grid wizard (see Santoro at Col. 13, Line 54 - Col. 14, Line 24). Santoro also assumes that each tile has a predetermined static size defined by the program implementing the grid (see Santoro at Col. 11, Line 63 - Col. 12, Line 19). Therefore, Santoro does not contemplate addition, removal, or relocation of a tile within the sidebar by an application associated with the tile (i.e., an application other than the application providing the grid) and does not provide methods and rules for controlling or managing such actions to prevent, for example, an application from spamming a sidebar (i.e., filling the sidebar with tiles associated with that application).

At pages 15-16 of the Office action, the Examiner cites the profiles disclosed in Santoro at Col. 22, Lines 1-22 and Col. 23, Lines 1-12 as disclosing managing tiles, but the disclosed profiles merely store predetermined data indicative of tile identity, size, and position on a server, and provide the data to a user's computer (or device) upon request. Thus, the cited portion of Santoro does not teach addition, removal, or relocation of a tile within a sidebar by an application associated with the tile.

In contrast to the cited art, aspects of the present invention are directed to an application implementing a sidebar that allows applications (i.e., applications other than the framework implementing the sidebar) to add tiles to the sidebar while providing superseding user control (i.e., manipulation) of the sidebar and its tiles. For example, if a user adds a tile to the sidebar via a tile configuration user interface program (e.g., a sidebar interaction interface), the tile appears at or near the top of the visible sidebar. However, if a program attempts to add a tile to the sidebar, the tile appears at the bottom of the sidebar, or may be forced into an overflow area. Additionally, if the tile that the program is attempting to add has been previously removed from the sidebar by the user, the tile cannot be added to the sidebar (or the overflow) without user intervention (see, for example, Application at paragraph [0069]-[0074]). Therefore, the sidebar of the present invention recognizes two distinct originators of requests (i.e., users and applications) and applies rules as a function of the originator.

At pages 4-12 and 16 of the Office action, the Examiner asserts that the grid wizard of Santoro is an application sending a manipulation request within the context of the claims of the present invention. This interpretation renders meaningless the distinction between a request originating from an application and a request originating from a user in the context of the present invention. Some sort of tile configuration user interface program, such as a wizard or utility, is necessary to provide user manipulation requests to the sidebar. Programs other than a tile configuration user interface program provide application requests to the sidebar (see Application at paragraph [0068]). For example, a newly installed application program may provide an application request to add a tile of the newly installed application program to the sidebar. However, the application request may be immediately superseded by a user request when an application request triggers a notification form the tile configuration user interface program asking for user input or denial of the request (see Application at paragraphs [0083]-[0084]). Thus, there are two distinct origins of requests in the present invention and a request with respect to a selected tile may be provided by a user or by an application associated with the tile (e.g., an application defining the tile). To this end, claim 1 recites, "… selecting an appropriate manipulation rule set based on an identity of the manipulation requestor, wherein a user manipulation rule set is selected if the identity of the manipulation requestor is a system user, and an application manipulation rule set is selected if the identity of the manipulation requestor is an application, wherein **said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program**…." Claim 13 recites, "…one or more application manipulation rules defining an appropriate disposition of the selected tile based on the indicated current status of the selected tile and the content of the request, wherein said application manipulation rules are used when the manipulation request originates from the application, wherein **said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program**…."

Claims 24, 30 and 32 reinforce that the source of a request affects the processing of that request by identifying three specific instances in which user requests and application requests are handled differently. Claim 24 recites, "…receiving the application request for manipulation of the selected tile, **wherein an application providing said application request is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program**, and wherein said request includes content… manipulating the tile in accordance with

the selected tile manipulation rule and the content of the request, wherein **if the current status is determined to be banned, the selected tile manipulation rule includes refusing entry of the selected tile in the sidebar** and refusing to reveal the selected tile." Claim 30 recites, "...**refusing a request from an application** to insert the selected tile into the sidebar, wherein said request from the application is received after removing the selected tile in response to the manipulation request from the user, wherein **said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program**...." Claim 32 recites, "...inserting the selected tile in a preferred sidebar position in response to receiving a user request to insert the selected tile; inserting the selected tile in less preferred sidebar position in response to receiving an application request to insert the selected tile, wherein **an application providing the application request to insert the selected tile is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program**...." None of the cited references cure this deficiency.

Additionally, at page 15 of the Office action, the Examiner asserts that Santoro at Col. 8, Lines 42-56 and Col. 11, Lines 33-45 teaches manipulation of a tile based on a current status of a selected tile. The cited portions of Santoro disclose a tile displaying a current status of a program or application associated with the tile. The cited portions of Santoro do not disclose determining a status of a tile as claimed in the instant application, and therefore cannot teach manipulating a tile as a function of a status of the tile.

In contrast, aspects of the present invention include determining the status of a tile and using the determined status to determine a manipulation with respect to the tile. To this end, claim 1 recites, "...in response to receiving said request, determining a current status of the selected tile, wherein the current status includes at least one of the group comprising: hidden, visible, newly installed, uninstalled, and banned...." Claim 13 recites, "... a status determination module configured to indicate a current status of the selected tile, wherein the current status includes at least one of the group comprising: hidden, visible, newly installed, uninstalled, and banned...." Claim 24 recites, "...determining a current status of the selected tile in response to the application request, wherein the current status is at least one of the group comprising: banned, hidden, newly installed, uninstalled, and visible...." None of the cited references cure this deficiency.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited art fails to teach elements of claims 1, 13, 24, 30, and 32 and that these claims are therefore allowable over the cited art. Claims 3-12, 14-23, 25-29, 31, and 33 depend from these claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-11 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santoro in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,316 to Oran et al. (hereinafter Oran). Oran is directed to a task bar for initiating applications, switching between open application windows, and viewing executing applications (see Oran at Col. 4, Line 66 - Col. 5, Line 18). Neither Oran nor any of the other cited references cures the deficiencies of Santoro with respect to independent claims 1 and 13 as explained above. Claims 10-11 and 21-22 depend from these claims, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-33 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/MAP/lav